



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOLUME XVI

October 1921

NUMBER 4

THE PERSIAN ARMY AND TRIBUTE LISTS IN HERODOTUS

BY A. G. LAIRD

Herodotus, iii. 90–94, groups the races paying tribute to Persia in twenty districts. It is evident that the numbers of these districts are not official. *οὗτος μὲν δὴ πρῶτος οἱ νομὸς κατεστήκει* (iii. 90) does not mean “this was appointed by him [Darius] to be the first division” (Macaulay). It was a Greek that called Ionia the first, Lydia the second, and Phrygia the third *nomos*. A Persian if giving numbers, would naturally begin as the Persian inscriptions do. From Behistun we have Persia, Susiana, Babylonia; from Persepolis, Susiana, Media, Babylonia; from Nakhsh-i-Rustam, Media, Susiana. Outside of this catalogue Herodotus does not use these numbers, but speaks of the Phrygian, Lydian, Ionian, Bactrian *nomes* (iii. 127; ix. 113). Once Ionia has been selected as the first, the order is fixed by geography. There are a few exceptions, it is true—startling exceptions, indeed; but few. The first eleven districts, containing forty-two out of a total of sixty-nine names, could hardly be improved, geographically speaking, except for *nomos* VII. The first three districts are the western Asia Minor nations. We move from the coast inland, Ionia, Lydia, Phrygia. From Cappadocia (Syria) in III we pass to Cilicia (IV) and down the Syrian (V) coast to Egypt and Libya (VI). The Ethiopians and Arabians, the associates of the Libyans in the army, are absent from this list because they send gifts instead of the regular taxes

(iii. 97). We, therefore, expect the Assyrians and Kissians to follow. Instead of that, a group of nations on the far eastern borders of the empire forms *nomos* VII, and then come the expected Kissians, Assyrians, Medes, Caspians (VIII–XI). In districts XII–XVII (I omit Armenia for the present) we have the remaining nations of eastern Asia, and then return in XVIII and XIX to eastern Asia Minor, moving from the Saspeirians to the Tibarenians to join on to *nomos* III. The position of India, cut off from its neighbors by XVIII and XIX, may seem to be another inexplicable departure from a geographical arrangement; but, unlike the cases of Armenia and *nomos* VII, this variation is explained by the text of Herodotus. India is put last because it paid in gold, the rest in silver. In iii. 89, Herodotus says: “He divided the provinces and the yearly payment of tribute as follows: and those of them who brought in silver were commanded to pay by the standard of the Babylonian talent, but those who brought in gold by the Euboean talent.” Then, after a brief aside, begins the catalogue. The first *nomos* is said to pay so many talents of *silver*. In the next eighteen divisions the *of silver* is omitted, except in the fourth and ninth. The Cilicians paid 360 *horses* and 500 talents of *silver*; the Assyrian tax was 1,000 talents of *silver* and 500 *eunuchs*. That is, the word *silver* is added only when something else besides money was contributed. The twentieth district, India, “brought in as tribute πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους 360 talents of gold.” The intention to emphasize the contrast is evident. In kind and amount of tribute India stands alone, and, therefore, last.

I return to Armenia. The position of the seventh group is peculiar; the composition of the thirteenth is amazing. “From Pactyike and the Armenians and the people bordering upon them as far as the Euxine, 400 talents: this is the thirteenth division.” And the only known Pactyike is on the borders of India (iii. 102)! It is unnecessary in this connection to discuss the exact meaning of ὑπερβαίνων τοὺς προσεχέας κτλ. (iii. 89), the phrase by which Herodotus describes Darius’ method of forming the taxation districts. No interpretation of it can justify the union in one *nomos* of nations so widely separated as the Armenians and the Pactyans. In the other divisions that contain two or more names there is no separation

at all. Every nation in a group borders upon at least one other nation of the group. At any rate this is true so far as our knowledge goes. The case of the Sacians and Caspians in *nomos* XV may be an exception. We do not know the position of these Caspians as distinguished from those of *nomos* XI. The commentators evade the Armenian-Pactyan difficulty. These Pactyans, so the most of them say, are obviously not the well-known ones, but neighbors of the Armenians. This view is quite untenable. In iii. 102 we are told that the Pactyans were neighbors of certain Indians, and the Bactrians are mentioned in the same sentence. From Pactyike, Scylax sailed down the Indus (iv. 44). These are the Pactyans of the army list, where they are named between the Sarangians and Utians. Their style of military equipment was used by the Utians, Mycans, Paricanians, and Sagartians (vii. 68, 85). In the tribute list the Bactrians are in *nomos* XII, the Pactyans in XIII, the Sarangians, Sagartians, Utians, and Mycans in XIV. Since the arrangement of the whole list is geographical, how can we, with these facts before us, refuse to admit that the Pactyans of *nomos* XIII are the neighbors of the Indians? And there is still another strong bit of evidence on the same side of the argument. Of the sixty names in the army list all but the Dorians and Ligygans are mentioned in the tribute section. There are six others, the Persians, Hyrcanians, Arabians, African Ethiopians, Colchians, and Aegean Islanders, whose names are not found in the twenty districts; but in iii. 96–97 we are told that the Persians were not taxed, that the Colchians, Ethiopians, and Arabians sent gifts, and that “as time went on additional tribute came in from the Islands also.” This last phrase would cover the Dorians¹ fairly well; but in any case we may be sure that Herodotus of Halicarnassus, however hazy his ideas about Pactyans and Ligygans might be, knew full well what he was doing when he omitted the name of the Dorians from the tribute-paying nations. As for the Hyrcanians, they are spoken of in iii. 117, and the reference to tribute at the end of the chapter brings this apparently isolated section into connection with the list. The most probable explanation

¹ Cnidus had submitted to Harpagus, i. 174. On the conquest of the islands see i. 169; ii. 130 ff. and 139; v. 30, 33. It is worth remark that Sparta is asked for help against Harpagus by the Ionians and Aeolians only (i. 152), and that Aristagoras appeals to Cleomenes without mentioning Dorians.

of the omission of their name from the twenty districts is that they are represented by the Caspians of *nomos* XI, since the Caspian Sea was also called Hyrcanian. There remain the Ligyans, and I shall presently show that they are not excluded, but disguised. With the sixty army names so completely covered by the tribute passage, it is very improbable that the army Pactyans are omitted. Their name being there and in the proper company—for it is the Armenians that are out of place—there can be but one conclusion. The Pactyans in the thirteenth district are the neighbors of the Bactrians in the twelfth. Why, then, are the Armenians with them? The Carmanians (i. 125) would be better associates, and the name is like enough to suggest the possibility of a textual error; but *'Αρμενίων* in iii. 93 is followed by “and the neighboring tribes¹ as far as the Euxine Sea.” Besides, the Armenians are in the army, and are too important to be omitted altogether. Since Armenia is regularly followed by Katapatuka in the three Persian inscriptions, I have been inclined, at times, to believe that this was confused with Paktuike; but Cappadocia (Syria) is in *nomos* III and the Pactyans are with their proper neighbors, the Bactrians, Sarangians, and the rest. There seems to be no escape from the conclusion that Herodotus has put together in one tribute district two widely separated nations. We should admit the fact and look for an explanation.

It has hitherto escaped observation that the difficulty in the thirteenth district has a parallel in the twelfth. Our texts give us *ἀπὸ Βακτριανῶν δὲ μέχρι Αἰγλῶν . . . φόρος ἦν.*² This is the reading of A B, but R S V have *Λιγδῶν*. The reason for the variation between *ΑΙΓΛΩΝ* and *ΛΙΓΔΩΝ* is obvious. Since the class represented by R S V is quite equal to the other, there is no ground whatever for preferring *Αἰγλῶν* to *Λιγδῶν*. Neither name is known. We cannot identify the *Αἰγλοί* with the *Αἴγαλοι* of Ptolemy vi. 12.

¹ This is a puzzling phrase. The races in *nomos* XIX lie between Armenia and the sea, and every race in this part of Asia Minor of which Herodotus shows any knowledge is mentioned elsewhere in the list; i. 28, which has the Chalybes, is spurious.

² The phrases describing the districts vary. The only other *μέχρι* is *ἀπὸ δὲ Ποσιδιῶν πόλεων . . . ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ ταύτης μέχρι Αἰγύπτου . . . φόρος ἦν.* This is used of *nomos* V and the *μέχρι* is exclusive, for Egypt is in VI. But *μέχρι* may be inclusive as in *μέχρι τῆς Ἰνδικῆς οἰκείται Ἀσίη* (iv. 40). The Aegli or Ligdi are a nation and must be in one of the districts. If they were not intended to be put with the Bactrians, they would have been placed elsewhere, as Egypt is.

Not only do the names differ, but our only authority for the Augali states that they are on the Iaxartes in the northern part of Sogdia, whereas Bactria is south of Sogdia. If we accept the reading of R S V we have to change but one letter to get ΛΙΓΤΩΝ from ΛΙΓΔΩΝ. To be sure, the Ligyans have nothing to do with the Bactrians, but this is the twelfth district, and in the thirteenth are the Armenians and Pactyans, who have no more right to be together. The Ligyans, according to Eustathius¹—compare Lycophron *Alex.* 1312—were a Colchian race. Therefore they were neighbors of the Armenians. Herodotus agrees with this, for in his army list, which, as we shall see, follows geography closely, he puts the Matienians, Ligyans, and Armenians in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first army corps respectively. Since the tribute list is also geographical and the Armenians are in district XIII, one would normally not hesitate to change an unknown Λιγδῶν in XII into Λιγύων. It seems, of course, absurd to group them with the Bactrians; but why not, when in XIII the Armenians, neighbors of the Ligyans, are grouped with the Pactyans, neighbors of the Bactrians? Further, of sixty army names the tribute passage omits only the Dorians and Ligyans. We can understand why Herodotus omitted the Dorians, but there is no reason for leaving out the Ligyans. If we accept Λιγύων for Λιγδῶν we get in XII another impossible district. This does not explain XIII; but in view of the neighborhood of the two pairs of nations it is plain that the reason for the one peculiar combination is the reason for the other. We are not convinced that such districts were possible, but we are entitled to draw the conclusion that, just as geography settled the composition and arrangement of the other and more normal districts, so too it played its part in the production of these two—in Herodotus. We shall see presently that there are similar, though less startling, combinations in the army corps.

Herodotus in vii. 61–95 names in separate groups the nations furnishing infantry, cavalry, and ships. In the following list I have combined them, keeping his order for the nations in the infantry and navy, but inserting those of the navy, italicized, in a solid block in

¹ *Ad Dion. Perieg.* i. 76: *ἰστέον δ' ὅτι ἑίκαστοι καὶ Κολχικοὶ τινες Λίγυες εἶναι ἄποικοι τῶν Εὐρωπαίων· καὶ δηλοῦ ὁ Λυκόβρων ἵστορῶν ἐν τοῖς Κόλχοις Κύναταιν Λιγυστικὴν πόλιν.*

the gap between the Libyans and Paphlagonians. No nation in the navy furnished horse or foot. The cavalry list has but two new names, the Sagartians and one of the Caspians. Though the tribute list has two Caspians, I have not inserted two here, because of the probability of a textual error. Of both it is said that they were equipped as in the infantry, there being only one in the infantry, whereas the Sagartians are spoken of as if really introduced for the first time. I have placed the Sagartians between the Pactyans and Utians because, though a branch of the Persians (i. 125; vii. 85), they were equipped in part like the Pactyans; and because in the tribute list they are in *nomos* XIV with the Utians and others, the Pactyans being in XIII. If the Οὐτιοι were the inhabitants of Yutiya, a district of Persia (Behistun inscription), we have outside evidence that the Sagartians and Utians belong together. The Asiatic Ethiopians are placed after the Indians because the two form one corps (vii. 70), though Herodotus reserves their name until he comes to the Ethiopians of Africa. He seems to have had them in mind when he wrote προσετεάχατο ('Ινδοι) συστρατεύμενοι Φαρναζάθρη (vii. 65), for στρατεύεσθαι is used fourteen times in vii. 61–81, the compound only here. Herodotus does not number the army corps. The Arabic numerals placed after the names show what corps are composed of one, two, or three nations. I have arranged the names in columns of ten. There is not the slightest suggestion of this in the text. I have done it because it brings out in a striking manner the geographical distribution of the races and offers a very convenient means of reference.

TABLE I
ARMY LIST VII. 61–95

| Eastern Group | | Southwestern Group | Asia Minor Group | | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| Persae-1 | Parthi-9 | Myci-15 | <i>Pamphyli</i> | Mariandyni-20 | Milyae-24 | |
| Medi-2 | Chorasmii-9 | Paricanii-16 | <i>Lycii</i> | Ligyes-20 | Moschi-25 | |
| Kissii-3 | Sogdi-10 | Arabii-17 | <i>Dores</i> | Syri-20 | Tibareni-25 | |
| Hyrcaeni-4 | Gandarlii-11 | Aethiopes-17 | <i>Cares</i> | Phryges-21 | Macrones-26 | |
| Assyrii-5 | Dadicae-11 | Libyes-18 | <i>Iones</i> | Armenii-21 | Mossynoeci-26 | |
| Bactrii-6 | Caspii-12 | Phoenices | <i>Isles</i> | Lydi-22 | Mares-27 | |
| Sacae-6 | Sarangae-13 | Syri | <i>Aeoles</i> | Mysi-22 | Colchi-27 | |
| Indi-7 | Pactyes-14 | <i>Egyptii</i> | <i>HellenPontii</i> | Thraces-23 | Alarodii-28 | |
| (Aethiopes)-7 | (Sagartii) | <i>Cyprii</i> | <i>Paphlagones</i> -19 | (Hyttennes)*-24 | Saspeires-28 | |
| Arii-8 | Uti-15 | <i>Cilices</i> | Matieni-19 | Cabeles-24 | Red Sea | |
| | | | | | Isles-29 | |

* A name is lost at the beginning of vii. 76. From Asia Minor only the Magnesians and Hyttennians of the tribute list are lacking. Of these two the latter, who are associated with the Cabelians in *nomos* II, must go with their neighbors, the Cabelians and Milyans, to make up this army corps.

A glance at this list will show that the nations of the infantry fall into three geographical groups, an eastern, containing the first sixteen corps, Persians—Paricanians; a southwestern, with Arabians, Ethiopians, and Libyans; and an Asia Minor group, Paphlagonians—Saspeirians. The only striking peculiarity is that the last nation, the Red Sea Islanders, who in the tribute list are joined with the Utians and Mycans in *nomos XIV*, are here completely separated from their neighbors and tucked away with the most remote races of Asia Minor. “How it [the item] comes to be appended to the solid phalanx of ten commanders from the twenty or one-and-twenty nations of Asia Minor, is one of the mysteries of the composition of Herodotus’ work in this portion” (Macan). There is no denying that the arrangement of the infantry is in the main geographical. Of the order of the nations in the eastern group more will be said later. We pass naturally from them to Arabia, Ethiopia, and Libya. Then comes Asia Minor. But why does Herodotus spring from the Libyans to the Paphlagonians? The nations on the coast being reserved for the navy, we should expect him to start the Asia Minor list with Lydia. Or, since the tribute list gives us Cappadocia, Cilicia, Phoenicia, Syria, Egypt, Libya, why did he not, when moving in the opposite direction and omitting the maritime nations, come up from Libya to Cappadocia? The answer to these questions is given by Table I, with the maritime nations inserted between the Libyans and Paphlagonians. The navy list begins with the Phoenicians, because they were the most famous seamen in the Persian Empire and, with the Syrians, furnished the largest number of ships. Apart from this the coast is followed in perfect geographical order from Egypt to Hellespontines. We are led around from Libya to Paphlagonia in the most natural manner possible.

It is not surprising that Herodotus should name the nations in the army with some regard to geographical position, but the perfect connection which the navy makes between the different groups of the infantry puts the matter in a new light. The western section of the empire thus becomes a whole. The list of names beginning with the Arabians and ending with the Saspeirians completes a *τεριόδος*. We are justified in assuming that the document upon

which Herodotus depended, whether an official Persian military list or not, went back for the arrangement of the names to a geographical *periodos* of the Persian Empire.

There is an interesting hint in the text of Herodotus that his source combined the infantry and navy. Of the Cabelians (infantry) he says in vii. 77 that they had the same equipment as the Cilicians (navy), and adds *τὴν ἐγώ ἐπεὰν κατὰ τὴν Κιλικῶν τάξιν διεξιῶν γένωμαι τότε σημανέω*—"and what this was I shall explain when in the course of the catalogue I come to the array of the Cilicians" (Macaulay). Macan remarks that "the reference forward from the army-list to the navy-list is remarkable." Rawlinson translates *τάξιν* "contingent," but the word does not fit the context. Macaulay's "array" is no better. The meaning is "when I come to the Cilicians in their proper order in the list," and the implication is that the two names are in one and the same list.

From the *periodos* point of view the position of the Red Sea Islanders becomes comprehensible. There is an eastern and a western section of the empire, and the Islands lie between them in the Persian Gulf. The order would be natural if the eastern nations were named first, then the Islanders, and then the western, Arabians—Sasperians (army order). But suppose we passed from the Paricilians, the last name in the eastern section, to the Saspeirians—and this is exactly what we find in the tribute list—and from the Saspeirians moved around to the Arabians. In that case the Red Sea Islanders would appear to be quite in place at the end of the western group. With a map before one, their position does not seem so strange, though they come in at the Saspeirian end of the western *periodos*. We may think of the Persian Empire as composed, roughly, of two great circles touching at Persia. In the army list we start from Persia and complete the eastern circle first, then the western, Arabians—Saspeirians. The Red Sea Islanders, who are near the meeting-point, Persia, but outside both circles, come in at the end. In the tribute list, if we overlook the difficulties of Armenia and *nomos VII*, the start is made from Ionia on the outside of the western circle, and we make a figure-eight movement. The direction for the western *periodos* is the opposite of what it is in the army.

If we examine the composition of the army corps, we find nothing quite so peculiar as the Armenian-Pactyan tribute district. If there are two or three nations in a corps, they are usually neighbors, to the best of our knowledge. See Numbers 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, in Table I. Armenia, indeed, goes with Phrygia, but Herodotus gives a reason. The Armenians are colonists of the Phrygians. Two of the corps are peculiar in containing nations rather widely separated. The Ligyans are put with the Cappadocians and Mariandynians, though, as we have just seen, there are two sources outside of Herodotus that place them with the Colchians, and Herodotus himself places them between the Matienians and Armenians in his geographically ordered army corps, and next to the Armenians in the tribute districts according to my correction in *nomos XII*. The second peculiar case is the combination of the Matienians with the Paphlagonians. In explanation of this it is customary to cite the statement of Herodotus (i. 72) that the Halyss, after flowing from Armenia through Cilicia, passed between the Matienians and Phrygians before turning north. On this ground a western branch of the Matienians is assumed; but, as was just pointed out in the case of the Pactyans and Ligyans, no army race is really omitted from the tribute list, and for this reason it is very difficult to believe that the same name in the two lists does not apply to the same nation. The Matienians of the tribute list are the associates of the Saspeirians and Alarodians of *nomos XVIII*, and for this location there is plenty of evidence in Herodotus and elsewhere. They are east of Armenia on the Royal Road (v. 49);¹ their mountains were the source of the Gyndes (i. 189), the Araxes (i. 202), and the Lesser Zab (v. 52); Hecataeus says that the Moschiens were a Colchian race bordering on the Matienians; and Strabo places Matiene in the northwest of Media (523). And, in spite

¹ In the description of the Royal Road the text at v. 52. 20 is admitted to be corrupt. In spite of v. 49. 36 it is impossible to believe that the Matienians extended to the borders of Kissia. A strong argument against such an extension, and one that has not been urged, so far as I have seen, is that Matiene in the tribute, army, and *acte* passages is confined to the northern *acte*. If it touched Kissia and, of necessity therefore, Assyria, it ought to have been mentioned in the southwestern *acte*, being west of Media. Thus one more nation would be added to those that the *three-nation* statement (see below) disregards.

of the different associates given to the Matienians by the army and tribute lists, a relation between the two lists is indicated by the order Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, Syrians (tribute) as compared with Paphlagonians, Matienians, Mariandynians, Ligyans, Syrians (army), the relative position of the races that are certainly western being the same. It might even be inferred from the words *Διγνες δὲ καὶ Ματιηνοὶ καὶ Μαριανδυνοί τε καὶ Σύροι τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντες Παφλαγόσι ἐστρατεύοντο* (vii.72) that the source of the army list recognized a connection between the Ligyans and Matienians as opposed to the Mariandynians and Syrians, even if Herodotus did not know it himself. There is no more difficulty in accepting the union of the eastern Matienians with the Paphlagonians than of the eastern Ligyans with the Mariandynians; and, even if the Matienians on the Halys had better evidence of existence, I should hardly hesitate, in view of all the facts, to pronounce the Matienians who are combined with the Paphlagonians to be the eastern neighbors of the Armenians. The placing of the neighboring Matienians and Ligyans in successive army corps (the nineteenth and twentieth), the former with the Paphlagonians, the latter with the Mariandynians, neighbors of the Paphlagonians, is a case exactly parallel to that of the twelfth and thirteenth tribute districts. Strangely enough, the Ligyans are involved in two of the four peculiar army and tribute combinations, one of which is in the army, the other in the tribute list; and their neighbors, the Matienians and Armenians, are in the other two, the former in the army, the latter in the tribute list. The following diagram will make the situation clearer. The Arabic numerals denote the army corps in the order in which they are named by Herodotus, the Roman, his numbers for the tribute districts. The arrangement of the names in vertical columns is geographical. The nations in the first column are west of the Halys except the Syrians (Cappadocians), those in the second are the eastern Asia Minor nations not on the Euxine, those in the third are in the far east beyond the Caspian Sea.

TABLE II

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------|
| III | <i>Hellenes pontines</i> | {28-Alarodii | XVIII | Sacae-6 |
| | Thrace-23 | {28-Saspeires | | |
| | Paphlagonia-19..... | 19-Matieni | | |
| | Mariandyni-20..... | 20-Ligyes..... | | XII.....Bactria-6 |
| | Syria-20 | 21-Armenia.... | | XIII.....Pactyes-14 |
| | Phrygia-21 | | | XIV.....Sarangia-13 |
| II | {Lydia-22 (Mysia-22 | | | |

When we consider to what extent the other army and tribute groups are determined by geographical position, how large a part geography plays in fixing the order of the names throughout both lists, it is difficult to explain the state of things illustrated by the foregoing diagram in any other way than on the assumption that on some monument¹ or document these names stood in parallel columns and in geographical order, and that such impossible combinations as the Armenian-Pactyan tribute district had no other basis than the accidental association of their names in adjacent columns. It is natural to suspect that the strange position of *nomos* VII had a similar origin. I can give no satisfactory explanation of this difficulty; but, to make clear the only suggestion I have to offer, I am going to give a rearrangement of the names in Table I, following a geographical order as strictly as possible. The result will also illustrate how far the combinations given in Table II are possible, and to what extent Herodotus varied from geography in his two lists. But, to get a more satisfactory basis for the division of the names into groups, it is first necessary to show the connection of the two lists with another passage in Herodotus, which is from a source that was, in the main, neither military nor fiscal, but geographic.

In iv. 37 ff. Herodotus, discussing the form and size of the earth, divides "Asia" into an eastern and a western part, and subdivides the western into two peninsulas, *ἀκταί*, which stretch westward from a north and south line defined by the Colchians, Saspeirians, Medes, and Persians. One of these *actae* is Asia Minor, the other is the rest of the western section, including Libya. This triple division is seen in the army list (Table I), whether the navy is inserted or not. The last nine names of the navy, Cilicians-Hellespontines, belong in Asia Minor, while the first four fall naturally into the southwestern *acte*, which (iv. 39) includes Phoenicia, Syria, and Egypt. Apart from the unexplained position of *nomos* VII, the tribute list preserves essentially the same division, though, as we

¹ Hdt. iv. 87: "Darius set up by the Bosphorus two pillars of white stone, inscribing upon the one in Assyrian characters, upon the other in Greek, all the nations that he led; and he was leading all that he ruled"; v. 86: "Hecataeus, the historian, argued against making war upon the King, giving a list of all the nations that Darius ruled."

have seen, Asia Minor is divided because the list starts with Ionia and completes the two circles by a figure-eight movement. That the tribute list, in spite of its additional names, was drawn largely from the same source as the army list is proved by the care with which the army names omitted in the twenty tax districts are accounted for in the following comments, by the order of several groups, but most of all by the remarkable resemblances and differences illustrated in Table II.

One striking proof of the connection of both lists with the *acte* passage is the statement in the latter (iv. 38) that Asia Minor was inhabited by thirty races. The army, allowing for the lacuna in vii. 76, has exactly that number. The tribute list has two races, the Magnesians and Hytennians, that are not in the army. It seems to me to be no slight proof of the identity of the two lists that the Hytennians fill so perfectly the army lacuna. With the Pactyans relegated to the far east and the Ligyans restored, and with the references to the Islands and Colchians in iii. 96, 97, the tribute passage has every name in the army, unless it be the Dorians: and the Islands may cover them. It adds the Magnesians and separates the Cabelians and Lasonians. Against the mere enumeration of a list of names in iii. 90 there is no reason why we should not accept the definite statement of vii. 77 that the Cabelians and Lasonians¹ were one race. Consequently, if we are to choose the

¹ Proper names were particularly exposed to corruption. I venture a suggestion about the Lasonians, the alternative name of the Cabelians (vii. 77), and, again, one that is quite unknown outside of the two lists. Herodotus says, Καβηλέῖς δὲ οἱ Μῆονες, Λασόνιοι δὲ καλεύμενοι, a very curious phrase, be it remarked. In vii. 74 he says that the Lydians Μῆονες ἐκαλεῦντο τὸ πάλαι. Strabo (630 f.) says that "they say" the Cabalians are Solymi, and a little later speaks of the Lydians who occupied Cabalis. We have, then, in Herodotus the succession Maeonians, Lydians, Lasonians, Cabelians; in Strabo, Lydians, Solymi, Cabelians. Choerilus names the Solymi among the nations in Xerxes' army, and his description of their headdress ἵππων δαρτὰ πρόσωπ' ἔφύρεν may well be an elaboration of Homer's Μῆονες ἵπποκορυσταί, and points to a connection of the Solymi and Maeonians. In iii. 90, A B C P have Ἀλυσονίων for Λασονίων, so that the first part of this unknown name is uncertain. ΣΟΑΛΥΜΟΙ might be taken for οννιοι since M is often read as NI and for ΝV there is a partial parallel in this very chapter (vii. 77) in MINVAI for MIAVAÍ. The curious phrase at the beginning of vii. 77 would sound somewhat better if it were Καβηλέῖς δὲ οἱ Μῆονες ΠΑΛΑΙ ΣΟΑΛΥΜΟΙ δὲ καλεύμενοι. The only mention of the Solymi in Herodotus is in i. 173: τὴν γὰρ νῦν Δύνιοι νέμονται, αὕτη τὸ πάλαισον ἦν Μιλνάς, οἱ δὲ Μιλναὶ τότε Σόλυμοι ἐκαλεῦντο. In vii. 77 the Μιλναὶ immediately follow the Καβηλέῖς who were called Λασόνιοι (Σόλυμοι).

thirty names it is necessary merely to decide which one of three to reject, the Magnesians, Dorians, or Islands. Since the Islands were inhabited by Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians, and, therefore, add no new race to those on the mainland, I hold that on this *thirty-nation* point the army, tribute, and *acte* passages are in complete agreement.

There are other connecting links between the so-called “digressions,” that follow the tribute list and the *acte* passage. In iii. 116 there is a reference to the Arimaspians and the gold-guarding griffins. These and their relation to the Hyperboreans are discussed again in iv. 13, 27, 32, and it is the Hyperboreans that introduce the comparison of “Asia” with Europe. In iii. 115 the same doubts are expressed about the sea surrounding Europe as in iv. 45. The information in iv. 44 concerning the voyage of Scylax, who sailed ἐκ Κασπατύρου τε πόλιος καὶ τῆς Πακτυκῆς γῆς is from the same source as that in iii. 102 about the Indians who are neighbors Κασπατύρω τε πόλι καὶ τῇ Πακτυκῇ χώρῃ. A couple of minor points of contact between the army and tribute passages might be added. The phrase describing the Red Sea Islands in iii. 93—ἐν τῇσι τοὺς ἀνασπάστους καλεομένους κατοικίζει βασιλεύς—is repeated in vii. 80. In iii. 91 we are told that Amphilochus founded Posideion, on the borders of Syria and Cilicia; in vii. 91 that he and Calchas colonized Pamphylia with Greeks from Troy.

In the description of the southwestern *acte* (iv. 39) it is stated that *only three* nations dwelt in it. It is useless to try to reconcile this statement with the two lists, for it is not reconcilable with its immediate context. The passage actually names six countries in the *acte*, all of which are occupied by nations that are in the lists as separate units. The suggestion that Phoenicia and Syria are to be included in Assyria (see Stein) must be rejected, for Herodotus never unites them. In fact he separates the Phoenicians and Syrians plainly enough here—τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ Φοινίκης παρήκει ἡ ἀκτὴ παρὰ τε Συρίην Παλεστίνην καὶ Αἴγυπτον—and in the tribute list—ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ νομῷ τούτῳ Φοινίκη τε πᾶσα καὶ Συρίη ἡ Παλεστίνη καλευμένη καὶ Κύπρος (iii. 91). Persia is said to be in the *acte*, though it clearly is not; and it is just as clear that Kissia, which is not mentioned at all, ought to be included; for, according to the definition, the whole

region west of the Persia-Media-Saspeires-Colchis line is in one or the other *acte*. The inclusion of Persia in the *acte* suggests that Herodotus knew nothing of the Persian Gulf, but this idea of the *actae* does not belong to Herodotus. That is evident from his statement that the southwestern *acte* ends at the Arabian Gulf only by *custom* (*νόμῳ*). Whoever conceived the idea must have known of the Persian Gulf and knew where Persia was. The *three-nation* statement also takes no account of Egypt, though it is certain that Egypt is in the part of the *acte* that does not include Libya, both from the words quoted above and from ἀπὸ γὰρ Αἰγύπτου Λιβύη ἥδη ἐκδέκεται. Again in iv.197 Egyptians are not included among the inhabitants of Libya. Plainly nothing can be made of the *three nations*, unless, indeed, the reference is only to that part of the *acte* described by τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ Φοινίκης κτλ., that is, to Phoenicia, Syria, and Egypt, just as Persia (? Kissia), Assyria, and Arabia are named on the other side. In the whole *acte*, including Libya, we can count nine or ten nations according as Babylonia is included in Assyria or separated from it as in the three Persian inscriptions. The ten in their geographical order are the Kissians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Arabians, Ethiopians, Libyans, Egyptians, Cyprians, Syrians, Phoenicians; or, we might pass from the Assyrians to the Phoenicians and so around to the Arabians.

Another question to be considered concerning the southwestern *acte* is the treatment of the Kissians and Assyrians in the two lists. We can hardly say that the tribute list leaves them in the southwestern division, when they are separated from the Libyans by *nomos* VII, composed of four nations east of Bactria and Sogdia. From the point of view of the triple division of Asia the position of VII becomes even more peculiar. It is not merely a matter of VII being named first in an eastern Asia group, after which there is a return to a normal order, which moves east from the head of the Persian Gulf; but VII stands in the very middle of the southwestern *acte*, having on the one hand Syria, Egypt and Libya (V and VI), on the other, Assyria and Kissia (VIII and IX). In the army the Kissians and Assyrians are mixed with nations belonging to eastern Asia. The first six names are Persians, Medes, Kissians, Hyrcanians, Assyrians, Bactrians. The order, until the Bactrians

are reached, would not strike one as ungeographical. The first five are leading nations in the empire, situated around the head of the Persian Gulf. Closer inspection reveals that there is a curious jumping back and forth over the Persia-Media line, from west to east, Kissians to Hyrcanians, back to the Assyrians westward, and eastward again to the Bactrians. This order will be fairly well explained, as well as that in the tribute list, if we put the Kissians and Assyrians in their proper group, the southwestern *acte*, and use the parallel column arrangement. See Table III.

The army list contains twenty-one eastern Asia names, if the Sagartians, a branch of the Persians (i. 101; vii. 85), are counted as a separate nation. The tribute list, which agrees closely with the army in the number and names of the nations living in the two *actae*, differs from it considerably in the eastern section. All the army names are accounted for, either in the lists or in the accompanying comments, but it adds eight new ones.¹ Six of these, the Aparytae (VII), the Paricanii and Orthocorybantii (X), the Pausicae, Pantimathi, and Dareitae (XI) are not mentioned elsewhere by Herodotus and are quite unknown to other sources. Five of these six are crowded into the Median and Caspian districts, and we should expect to find them among the subdivisions of the Medes (i. 101), or in Strabo's list (514) of the races dwelling around the Caspian Sea. It has been pointed out that the Paretaceni (i. 101) may be meant by the Paricanii. When the confusion of surds and sonants in Agbatana and Ecbatana, Germanii (i. 125) and Karmanii is considered, it seems possible that the *Boūσαι* of i. 101 are identical with the Πανσοί (*v.l.* for Πανσικοί in iii. 92). It may be added that Orthocorybantii looks suspiciously Greek, and more like a descriptive epithet than an actual name (? ὁρθὰς κυρβασίας ἔχοντες; cf. vii. 64). On the whole it is fair to assume that these five races are subdivisions that would not ordinarily be counted. That assumption is certainly justified in the case of *nomos* X, since Media, as well as Kissia and Assyria, was large enough and important enough to form a *nomos* by itself. The other new names are the Thamanaeans (XIV) and the Sattagydae (VII). The former are unknown outside of Herodotus, but are mentioned twice in the tribute section,

¹ Nine, if there were two Caspians in addition to Hyrcanians.

in the list and in iii. 117, in both places immediately after the Sarangians. The Sattagydae are in all three Persian inscriptions, either beside or close to the Gandarians, as in Herodotus. They are therefore better known than the Dadicae, who, though placed with the Gandarians in both army and tribute lists, are not found in other sources.¹ The army list, then, names twenty or twenty-one nations from eastern Asia, the tribute passage twenty-eight or twenty-nine,² some of which are probably unimportant subdivisions. The *acte* passage does not in this case give the number of the races; but, fortunately we have what might be called the prevalent Greek view in the statement attributed to an Athenian speaker at the battle of Plataea (ix. 27), namely, that the Athenians had conquered forty-six nations at Marathon. This is the exact number in the infantry list—the Sagartians are not among them—and when the maritime nations and Sagartians are added the total for the empire is sixty. The recurrence of the number sixty and its multiples in the Persian army figures has been dwelt upon by Munro (J.H.S., XXII, 296) and Macan, and there is good reason to consider it a kind of standard. Asia Minor having thirty, and the south-western *acte* ten, twenty are left for eastern Asia. There are twenty-three names to choose the twenty from, those in the army list with the Sattagydians and Thamanaeans; and our sources vary. The Persians are in the army list and at Behistun; they are not in the tribute list nor at Persepolis. The Sagartians are not in the infantry nor at Behistun; they are in the cavalry and tribute lists and at Persepolis. The Indians (see below) are not at Behistun. The Thamanaeans are not in the army nor in any of the Persian inscriptions. Fortunately for the purpose of comparing the order in the

¹ Of the four races in *nomos* VII the army list knows only two, the Gandarii and Dadicae; the Persian inscriptions only two, the Gandarii and Sattagydae; and two, the Dadicae and Aparytae, are unknown outside of Herodotus. Of the sixty names in the army list the Dadicae and Alarodii alone are not found in other sources. The Myci, Paricanii, and Mares are cited from Hecataeus in Steph. B., and the Utii are supported by the name Yutiya at Behistun. Hecataeus used the form Γανδαρική. Δαδική may have come from this. Since Η and ΤΤ were often confused, ΑΠΑΡΤΤΑΙ and ΣΑΤΤΑΙΤΤΔΑΙ are not unlike. In the transmission of Herodotus' text it is not improbable that the army and tribute lists, with their numerous little-known names, reciprocally influenced one another, though the army list was protected from increase by the forty-six-nation tradition.

² Including the Persians and Hyrcanians, and omitting one of the Caspians.

army and tribute lists with a good geographical order, it is enough to stick closely to the army list, for the new names in the other are all associated in the districts with nations that are in the army, and the districts are presumably geographical units. While the order in the two lists varies greatly, there are some resemblances. The Bactrians come earlier in both than their location would lead us to expect. In both Parthians, Chorasmians, Arians, and Sogdians hang together, and also the Paityans, Sarangians, Utians, and Mycans. The Medes are at the beginning and the Paricanians at the end in both lists. The selection of a good geographical order is greatly aided by such groups as the army's Arians, Parthians, Chorasmians, Sogdians, Gandarians, Dadicans; or this in the tribute list, Bactrians, Paityans, Sagartians, Sarangians, Thamanaeans, Utians, Mycans, Islands. Both series are correct to the best of our knowledge. For comparison with the arrangement of the eastern nations which I make in the following list, I give the Behistun¹ order from Parthia to the end, viz., Parthia, Drangiana (Sarangia), Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdia, Gandara, Sacae, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Maka. The last two names, which are not in the lists of Herodotus, seem to cover the southern group, the Paityans, Utians, Mycans, and Paricanians.

In the following geographical arrangement of the names I have kept the division in columns of ten, which was suggested by the ten of the southwestern *acte*, the thirty of Asia Minor, and the total of sixty. I have assumed that one of the Caspians of the tribute list was the Hyrcanians. Both Sagartians and Thamanaeans are included, the Red Sea Islands and Indians being placed between the columns; the latter might be a later addition to the original sixty. Army corps are indicated by Arabic numerals, tribute districts by Roman. The repetition of the first name in each column at the end is intended to indicate the effect that would be produced if this list were written on a cylindrical roll with the columns running round the roll so that the first and last names met. The Matieni, Saspeires, and Alarodii of *nomos* XVIII would thus be brought together, or the Sacians and Ethiopians of corps six and seven.

¹ This list is geographically arranged. There are three lines running from the center of the empire, (1) Persians-Ionians, (2) Medes-Cappadocians, (3) Parthians-Mecians. The Persepolis inscription unites the first two lines.

TABLE III

| Southwestern Group | Eastern Group | | Asia Minor Group | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1-Persia | 6-Sacae-XV | Matien | 19 Paphlag-III |
| 3-Kissia-VIII | 2-Medes-X | 6-Bactria | XII | Cilic-IV |
| 5-Assyria-IX | 4-Hyrcan-XI | 14-Pactyes | XIII | Pamphyll-I |
| Phoenix-V | 12-Caspri-XV | 13-Sarang-XIV | 25-Tibar-XIX | Lycia-I |
| Syria-V | 9-Parthi-XVI | Sagart-XIV | 26-Mossyn-XIX | Dores |
| Cyprus-Y | 9-Choras-XVI | (Thaman) XIV | 26-Macron-XIX | Caria-I |
| Egypt-VI | 8-Arii-XVI | 15-Uli-XIV | 27-Mares-XIX | Ionia-I |
| 18-Libya-VI | 10-Sogdi-XVI | 15-Muci-XIV | 27-Colchi | Isles |
| 17-Ethiop | VII, 11-Gandar | XVII, 16-Paric XIV-Isles-29 | 28-Alarod-XVIII | Aeolis-I |
| 17-Arabs | VII, 11-Dacie | XVII, 7-Ethiop XX-Indi-7 | 28-Saspeir-XVII | Hellep-III |
| 3-Kissia-VIII | 1-Persia | 6-Sacae-XV | Matien-XVIII | 23-Thrace-III |
| | | | Paphlag-III | Cilic-IV |

Asia Minor.—A *periodos* might begin with the Cilicians, run round the coast to the Colchians, and return to the Milyans; but in both army and tribute lists there is indicated a division into an eastern and a western section, in spite of the mixture in two or three army corps. The tribute list makes the Halys the boundary line, except that Cappadocia¹ (Syria) is placed with western nations in the third district. In the army it is joined with the Ligyans of the east and the Mariandynians of the west. The foregoing order for the western section, Cilicians–Milyans, a small *periodos*, needs no explanation, though it might be pointed out that Thracians, Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, instead of Thracians, Mariandynians, Paphlagonians is justified because the Paphlagonians bordered on the Thracians, the Mariandynians occupying a small bit of the coast between them. The eastern part begins with the Saspeires to connect with eastern Asia (i. 104), runs up to the Pontus, along the coast to the Tibarenians, and back by the interior to the Moschians, another small *periodos*.² Our authorities tell us that Matiene was directly east of Armenia, that the Ligyans were Colchians, and that the Moschians were a Colchian race bordering on the Matienians. My arrangement will agree with this if both the Ligyans and Matienians touched the eastern boundary of Armenia, the former on the north, and if both Ligyans and Moschians were on the northern border of Matiene, the Moschians east of the Ligyans. The Alarodians are known only from Herodotus. By the definition of the *actae* they should be west of the Colchis–Persia line. Since the Saspeires border on Colchis (i. 104) we might put the Alarodians in the northwest corner of the Saspeires, just east of the Moschians. For the union of the Phrygians and Armenians in one corps, Herodotus has the explanation that the latter were colonists of the Phrygians. Hesychius' statement that the Matieni were equipped like the Paphlagonians may have contributed to that peculiar combination.

¹ Compare *οἱ ἑντὸς Ἀλυս ποταμῷ νομοὶ ἔχοντες* (v. 102). It is uncertain how far satrapies and tribute districts were the same. This sentence excludes Cappadocia from the satrapies west of the Halys. Was Herodotus right when he included it in *nomos III*?

² When the two *periodi* are placed in three columns the Moschians follow the Milyans as in Herodotus. Table III offers an explanation of the union in one corps of the Moschians and Tibarenians, who are not neighbors.

It will be observed that in Table III Armenia stands between Paktyike and Syria (Katapatuka). Geographically Cappadocia might have been placed between the Tibareni and Armenia. That the extraordinary tribute district, Armenia-Paktyike, may have arisen from some such list as Table III and a confusion of Paktuike and Katapatuka is at least possible. The Bactrian-Ligyan *nomos* would follow.

East Asia.—In the arrangement of these nations there is an eastern movement, Persians-Sacians, which takes in the northern group; with the Bactrians there is a turn to the west and south. The position given to the Bactrians is based upon a combination of Herodotus and the Persian inscriptions. The Parthians, Arians, Chorasmians, and Sogdians are together in both of Herodotus' lists; in the inscriptions the Bactrians break up the group at one point or another. If they are not to precede Sogdia we may, as at Behistun, keep together Sogdia, Gandara, Sacae, and Sattagydia, put the Bactrians after them and with their neighbors, the Pactyans, and thus begin the turn toward the west. The Bactrians and Sacians, who were probably not neighbors, though in one army corps, might in this way have followed one another in a list.

As to the peculiar position of *nomos* VII there is little to be learned from Table III, though the following differences between tribute and army order are perhaps worth pointing out. The Ethiopians and Arabians, who follow the Libyans and end column 1, are not in the tribute list. There the Libyans are followed by the Gandarii and Dadicae, who in the army follow the Sogdians at the end of column 2. In the tribute list the Paricanians and Ethiopians follow the Sogdians at the end of column 2, while in the army the Paricanians¹ come after the Mycans at the end of column 3. The Red Sea Islands are next to the Mycans of column 3 in the tribute list; in the army they follow the Saspeires at the end of column 4. Whether this regularity of shifting position was accidental or not, I do not venture to say. Yet the following fact seems to prove that *nomos* VII was actually grouped by Herodotus among the nations

¹ I might add the Ethiopians, for, though with the Indians in the seventh corps, they are not mentioned until after the Paricanians, with the Arabians alone between the two.

of the southwestern *acte*. The seven districts in Asia Minor¹ contributed 2,520 silver talents to the royal treasury, if we reckon Cilicia's tax at 360, not at 500,² talents—that is, if we omit the 140 talents spent upon the Horse Guards (iii. 90), as they are omitted in the sum total of gold and silver tribute (iii. 95). Now exactly the same sum, 2,520 silver talents, which was levied on the northern *acte*, was the income from the southwestern, provided that we place *nomos* VII where its number seems to place it, with Syria and Egypt-Libya, V and VI, on the one hand, and Kissia and Assyria, VIII and IX, on the other.

There has been some criticism of the items assigned by Herodotus to the tax districts. It has been claimed that some were too large or too small in comparison with others, the size and probable wealth of the districts being taken into consideration. No one, so far as I know, has remarked upon the symmetrical distribution of the total, of which there is more evidence than the equality of the sums apportioned to the two *actae*. The eastern group contributed 2,560 talents, so that the total of 7,600 silver talents is divided among the three parts of the empire almost as evenly as possible. That it is not more even may be explained by the fact that Asia Minor's 2,520 talents from seven districts is an average of 360 to the district. This favorite Babylonian number, 360, recurs in the taxes of the Phrygian, Cilician, and Bactrian districts, in the number of gold talents that India paid, and in the number of white horses levied on the Cilicians. Twenty districts, paying an average of 360 talents, would contribute a total of 7,200. That this was the original total seems to me fairly certain from the MSS reading in iii. 95, where the sum of silver talents is said to be 9,540 Euboic talents = 7,340 Babylonian. Our texts read 9,880 Euboic = 7,600 Babylonian. The correction is based upon the fact that the silver items make up 7,600 or 7,740, according as the extra Cilician 140 is excluded or not, and it is further supported by the fact that, if India's gold tax be subtracted from the grand total of gold and silver, the silver remainder is 7,600 Babylonian talents. My contention is that the

¹ I count the Armenian-Pactyan district in Asia Minor, the Bactrian-Ligyan in eastern Asia, the known nation in each case overshadowing the less known.

² The 500 is repeated in the Royal Road passage, v. 49.

9,540 Euboic = 7,340 Babylonian is the original 7,200 total plus the extra 140 Cilician item. There is further evidence of this in the closing words of iii. 96—*εξήκοντα τὸ δ' ἔπι τούτων Ἐλασσον ἀπιεῖς οὐ λέγω.* The words have no application to the figures in our texts, for no number less than *ten* is anywhere neglected; but 7,340 Babylonian talents equals 9,542 Euboic, and to call it 9,540 drops the *two*. A slight additional support of an original 7,200 total I find in India's tax of 360 gold = 3,600 silver talents (Babylonian). The item is admitted to be too large in comparison with others. I believe it to be an estimate, such as Herodotus says that he makes when dealing with the army of Xerxes (vii. 184-85). His estimates there are in a proportional relation to the totals, and India's 3,600 is one-half of an original 7,200. According to the theory that there were twenty districts contributing an average of 360 talents, India would be a later addition. Stein (iii. 89) expresses the opinion that the passage beginning with the distinction between gold and silver tribute was a later insertion by the author. India, it should be remarked, is not in the Behistun inscription, though in the other two. Of course, if India were an addition to an original twenty, there must have been some readjustment of the other districts to keep the number at twenty.

The evidence of symmetry in these figures, taken with the improbability of various items, justifies us in hesitating to accept the view that Herodotus based his tribute list upon good official sources. Such districts as Pactyia-Armenia and Ligyia-Bactria prove that for the remoter parts of the empire he had no accurate information, but drew wrong inferences from sources that were primarily geographical.